

Dear Jim,

Heine Case

3/2/76

The affidavits by Helms and Houston are brief but I think helpful.

The appear to make claim to the propriety of ~~domestic~~ domestic activity otherwise illegal as part of the protection of intelligence sources.

The sole basis of the campaign against Heine was a report received by a "counterintelligence agent," I suppose at Langley. There was at one point an apparent intension of masking this.

This is to say that some crazy right-winger gets a report that by crazy right-wing logic becomes fact and everyone above him, lacking any other knowledge, is within the law in violating it- all inside the United States.

It even becomes a protection of intelligence sources falsely to call a man KGB. If it were true I can't see how it could protect intelligence sources.

What I'm sure is the case is that Heine was a bit on the liberal side and the CIA of that period wanted its emigres, who were used in all kinds of demonstrations, to be under extreme-right leadership. Thus domestic activity also becomes part of the protection of intelligence sources, too.

Anything can be.

I think we can expect this. And should be prepared to use it.

Williams actually used it in court. I presume his was one of the court's assurances.

This coincides in time with his representation of us, too.

Pretty farout!

Nobody knows, nobody can even learn if this "counterintelligence agent" was insane. Or if he personally invented the "report." Or if his ~~xxx~~ "analysis" ~~is~~ is within reason.

The combination is terrible: anything that CIA wants to ^aall the protection of intelligence sources is, ipso facto, the protection of intelligence sources. It can be irrational, non-existent even fabricated and it justifies any domestic illegal act.

Like spying on me?

Best,